

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated April 14, 2008, claim 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Tiv for conducting an interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on July 9, 2008. Applicants believe that agreement was reached regarding subject matter that overcomes the cited art. Applicants submit with this response amendments to the claims which Applicants believe overcome the cited art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 12-19, 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over a CNN.com webpage dated January 29, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as "CNN") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Dunko.") This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 recites the feature of "determining whether the recipient is configured to access the content sharing system; and based on at least one of the received information and the determination of whether the recipient is configured to access the content sharing system." Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references do not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

CNN discloses a method of emailing a web page to an email address from a form presented on the webpage. However, this reference does not disclose or suggest determining whether the recipient is configured to receive the content or interact with any type of content sharing system. Dunko discloses a system where a content user and a remote user contact each other using some form of communication and activate a content sharing session at a given time to share content from a content source device. Dunko does not disclose or suggest

determining whether the recipient is configured to receive the content or interact with any type of content sharing system. In order for a reference or references to anticipate or render a claim obvious, they must teach and/or suggest all of the recited elements as well as the arrangements of those elements. CNN and Dunko, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Independent claims 12, 17, 28, and 37 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over CNN in view of Dunko. Claims 12, 17, 28, and 37 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. These claims now include the feature of “the content sharing system determines whether identified recipients are configured to access the content sharing system, and generates a content sharing message based on the determination,” or features substantially similar. As set forth herein in regard to claim 1, CNN and Dunko, taken separately or together, fail to disclose this feature of claims 12, 17, 28, and 37. Therefore, Dunko and Freeze, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claims 12, 17, 28, and 37. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12, 17, 28, and 37 are allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 17, 28, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In the Office Action, independent claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dunko in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 issued to Tso et al (hereinafter referred to as “Tso.”) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 21 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Claim 21 now recites the feature of “wherein at least one of the multiple gateways is configured for determining whether the mobile devices are configured to interact with the content sharing application.” As set forth herein, Dunko discloses a system where a content user and a remote user contact each other using some form of communication and activate a content sharing session at a given time to share content from a content source device. Dunko does not disclose or suggest at least one of the multiple gateways is configured for determining whether the mobile devices are configured to interact with the content sharing application. Tso is directed to a system for sending information to a targeted group of users. However, Tso does not disclose

or suggest multiple gateways configured for determining whether the mobile devices are configured to interact with the content sharing application. In order for a reference or references to anticipate or render a claim obvious, they must teach and/or suggest all of the recited elements as well as the arrangements of those elements. Dunko and Tso, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the remaining claims, all of which are dependent upon claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37, either directly or indirectly. However, in view of the amendments and traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, Applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

DOCKET NO.: CING-0648/887.US
Application No.: 10/821,608
Office Action Dated: April 14, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-40, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2008

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/

Aaron F. Bourgeois

Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439